

***FINAL MINUTES***

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE***

***MEETING***

***June 23-24, 1999***

***Shilo Inn***

***Klamath Falls, Oregon***

June 23, 1999

9:00AM

**Agendum 1. Convene and Opening Remarks**

**Members present**

**Representative Seat**

Mike Belchik	Yurok Tribe
David Bitts	Task Force Vice-Chair and California Salmon Fishing Industry
Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
John Engbring	Task Force Chair and Department of the Interior
Chris Erikson	Trinity County
Paul Kirk	Humboldt County
Elwood Miller, Jr.	Klamath Tribe
Al Olson	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ronnie Pierce	Alternate for Karuk Tribe
Don Reck	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mike Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
Don Russell	Klamath County
Joan T. Smith	Siskiyou County
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

John Engbring made opening remarks. John Engbring thanked Jim Carpenter and Alice Kilham for the soiree and boat tour sponsored by Klamath Basin Ecosystem Foundation and Hatfield Working Group. It was a great opportunity to get together. Also is another informal social hour after today's meeting.

**Agendum 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance**

No congressional staff present.

**Agendum 3. Business**

**a. Adoption of agenda**

Additions to the agenda:

Introductions of new members to the Task Force. Mike Belchik is replacing Troy Fletcher to represent the Yurok Tribe. A letter was received from Troy Fletcher at the meeting verifying this appointment and allowing Mr. Belchik to vote. Paul Kirk will replace Mitch Farro for Humboldt County. Ronnie Pierce is an alternate for Leaf Hillman of the Karuk Tribe. Chris Erikson will replace Ralph Modine of Trinity County. All other members remain the same.

Add Agendum 5e. John Engbring requested an update on Al Olson's letter on Klamath National Forest fishery data collection.

Add Agendum 5f. Mike Rode requested a presentation on the Cooperative Agreement from the Klamath Watershed Coordination Group.

Add Agendum 5g. Keith Wilkinson requested a report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on outmigrant trapping.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Wilkinson) to adopt amended agenda.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Smith)**

Public Comment: It was suggested that public comment be called for before approving a motion and do this throughout the day.

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\***

**Agendum 3b. Adoption of minutes from February 1999 meeting**

Copies of the minutes were requested by Joan Smith, Ronnie Pierce, Elwood Miller, and Mike Orcutt.

Joan Smith requested that copies of the minutes be sent with handouts before the meeting. Belchik had not had a chance to look at the minutes. Dave Bitts suggested that we defer the adoption of the minutes to tomorrow morning. The Task Force agreed. Keith Wilkinson added that on page 16, the third paragraph down, that PMFC should be changed to PSMFC. Minutes were adopted the following morning.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Wilkinson) To adopt the Minutes from the February meeting with the corrections from Wilkinson.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Rode)**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\***

**Agendum 3c. Express gratitude to Shasta and Scott CRMP coordinators for helping out with field visits for Siskiyou Daily News and NCRWQCB 319h representatives**

John Engbring announced that on April 13, 1999, Jeffy Davis-Marx, Scott CRMP Coordinator, and Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP Coordinator, assisted Yreka FWO staff in providing a tour of restoration projects to Lance Masterson, reporter, of the Siskiyou Daily News. The product is the April 30, 1999, news article (see informational handout). On May 20, 1999, Jeffy and Dave assisted Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office (YWO) staff in providing a tour of projects funded by the Clean Water Act 319h program to Bernadette Reed of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Agendum 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/status of program**

Laurie Simons summarized the assignments and motions from the last meeting. Laurie summarized the correspondence since the last meeting. (see Agendum 4 handouts). John Engbring asked about the \$100 million for salmon for the four States: Alaska, California, Oregon, and Washington. Joan Smith said the Bill has been approved by the Senate and has gone to the House of Representatives.

Mike Orcutt inquired about why no Budget Committee meeting was scheduled before the proposal ranking by the Technical Work Group (TWG). Mike Rode understood that they decided it was not necessary. Rode wanted to know who all got budget committee letters. Laurie Simons mentioned everyone on the Budget Committee: Mike Rode, Kent Bulfinch, Mike Orcutt, Keith Wilkinson, and Joan Smith. Mike Orcutt wanted to know what is the protocol for the address given on the top of a Task Force letter to the congressional committee. John Engbring explained that the letters were signed by him from the Sacramento Office and that it doesn't matter what address is put on the letterhead.

Simons explained that the list of FWS Restoration Projects in the Agendum 4 handouts is for the entire basin but that Klamath Falls Partners for Fish and Wildlife projects were not included. John Engbring said that this is a great way to see the projects pulled together. He would like to see a big list of all the agency projects. Joan Smith pointed out that she is concerned with redundancy of funding. She thanked Simons for putting it together.

**Agendum 5a. Old business, Status of Draft Letter to Secretary Babbitt on Administrative Costs (Pierce)**

Ronnie Pierce gave an update on the letter to Secretary Babbitt on administrative funding. Ms. Pierce requested the Department of Interior, John Engbring, to seek legal council on taking the administrative costs out of the Klamath Act budget. Engbring felt that the response would probably be similar to the last letter written on the \$80,000, which came back to him to answer. Bulfinch understood Ronnie Pierce's frustration. Last year, the Yreka FWO staff provided the exact breakdown of where the money went. \$80,000 went to the Regional Office. What do we get for that \$80,000? Can we get a report on what they are providing? Ronnie Pierce wanted the Task Force to know that she is not questioning the efficiency of the Yreka Office or the Regional Office. The problem is that the costs of doing this work should come out of the Department of Interior and the State of California separate from the restoration funds. John Engbring added as far as the \$80,000, we do get value from processing of the agreements through the Regional Office for sufficiency review, for payment of invoices, etc. Mike Spear has

talked with Mary Nichols, of the Resources Agency, regarding California issues, but Engbring does not have the specifics. Dave Bitts suggested that a draft letter would go from the Task Force and the Vice-Chair (see Agendum 5a handout). He understood Engbring is saying that these letters never get into the Agency loop to get considered, just bounced back. Bulfinch asked if it should be addressed to the Solicitor. Engbring said he could ask for a Solicitor's review. Bitts suggested that copies be sent to members of Congress. Russell told the Task Force that the Secretary cannot just find money without appropriations from Congress. Pierce still wanted to see a legal opinion. Wilkinson wanted to table this until after the Long-term Report discussion. Bitts wanted to take action on this at Agendum 11 this afternoon. Engbring reported that he will do the following in the afternoon:

**\*\* Assignment\*\*** John Engbring will ask Mary Ellen Mueller to review the draft letter by Ronnie Pierce to Secretary Babbitt on administrative costs. Engbring will discuss any representation changes with Bitts and Pierce before sending the letter. Engbring will take the letter to the Solicitor's Office for an opinion.

#### **Agendum 5b. Old Business, FY2000 budget as approved at last meeting**

A handout is provided showing the budget allocations for the three categories of project funding for fiscal year 2000 that were approved by the Budget Committee last November (see Agendum 5b handout).

#### **Agendum 5c. Old Business, Status of appointment letters/charter**

We received appointment letters for Leaf Hillman (Karuk Tribe), Chuck Blackburn (Del Norte County), Joan Smith (Siskiyou County), Chris Erikson (Trinity County), Paul Kirk (Humboldt County - replacing Mitch Farro who has been serving for the past 10 years). The Charter needs to be renewed this year (every 2 years) (see Charter from 1997, Agendum 5c handout). Yreka FWO staff will process this.

#### **Agendum 5d. Old Business, Status of funding for Klamath gauges (Rode)**

Mike Rode stated that, as reported at the last meeting, four gauges are unfunded. He emailed Bill Bennett of Department of Water Resources about gauge funding (see Agendum 5d handout). Temporary funding of some gauges is continuing. The Klamath National Forest funds the Salmon River gauge. Mike Friegal, from the US Geological Survey (USGS), said Seiad and Happy Camp gauges are funded through this fiscal year and possibly through fiscal year 2000, but no funding for the Scott and Shasta for fiscal year 2000.

The May 5, 1999, letter to Secretary Babbitt (see Agendum 4 handout ) identified all the gauges, a map, and the justification. The USFS will fund the Salmon River gauge in fiscal year 2000. The Yurok Tribe is funding the Klamath gauges at the mouth for now, but it is not stable funding. Kent Bulfinch reported that Shasta CRMP has provided a list of the gauges, who has funded them, and what has not been funded, etc. Bulfinch believes we need a gauge committee to identify the required gauges and secure funding. Engbring asked if the May 5<sup>th</sup> letter is complete. Bulfinch stated it is probably not complete because the Shasta list is large and there is only one Shasta gauge on the letter. Mike Rode said the May 5<sup>th</sup> letter lists only USGS gauges, the other Shasta gauges are not USGS, and are questionable.

Mike Rode stated that on the Trinity, all gauges but one are funded by the restoration program. Joan Smith added that the May 5<sup>th</sup> letter indicates that the State match is only two gauges. Mary Nichols may provide more State funding if we ask because the Klamath Act asks for equal matching from the State. Engbring said that the flow study funding request has the gauges included in it. The TWG reported that USGS gauges function as a network that, as a minimum, needs to be funded intact. The flow study asks for more, but it is not unreasonable. Smith suggested having a gauge committee to research solutions to the funding issue. Erikson suggested that the TWG review the technology for gauges and that \$15,000 is possibly too much. Engbring agreed that we should look at the technical side plus the policy. Belchik agreed that the TWG should provide the technical input. The TWG could provide a more comprehensive report on specific gauges, costs, etc.

The TWG is aware that the USGS charges a lot per gauge. USGS provides publishing, standardized data, increased acceptance, and credibility. Rode understood that Marshall Flug found a problem with incomplete data. Smith suggested that it would be best to get the State to fund the gauges or develop a set of criteria and do it cheaper. Engbring decided to ask the TWG to go to USGS and provide the Task Force with more information. James Wroble, new TWG Chair, reported that USGS gauges are needed as a minimum for flow study and may need more for restoration program needs. USGS gauging data are published with high standards. The TWG could do a report on gauges soon

**\*\*Task Force Chair Assignment\*\*** Task Force Chair assigned the TWG to report on stream gauges in the Klamath Basin

looking at historical and current funding sources, if available, and include USGS expertise, to the extent possible. Where gauges are needed, identify what information is needed to produce the information, including the costs. Also, in the report, the TWG will: 1) include a discussion of telemonitoring and appropriate water quality parameters to monitor, 2) examine existing data and make sure any newly designed gauges would collect the appropriate data, and 3) identify any additional gauge monitoring that would be needed. The TWG needs to identify any redundancies. The TWG will provide a handout to Yreka FWO two weeks before the October meeting.

**Agendum 5e - Old Business - Draft letter from Task Force to Klamath National Forest expressing the importance of the fishery data they have collected over the years.**

Al Olson drafted a letter for the Task Force to send to USFS requesting continued support of their fisheries work (see Agendum 5e handout). After discussion it was decided that it should be sent to both Six Rivers National Forest and Klamath National Forest. Engbring wanted to send it to Brad Powell of the Department of Agriculture, also.

Elwood Miller noticed the Klamath Tribe is not on the letterhead of a previous Task Force letter!! The Yreka Staff will see that it gets fixed.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Staff will send out a draft letter from the Task Force to Brad Powell, Department of Agriculture, expressing the importance of the fishery data the Forest Service has collected over the years and to request continuing funding. Cc: Six Rivers National Forest and the Klamath National Forest.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Staff will ensure that the Klamath Tribe is on the letterhead used for any Task Force correspondence.

**Agendum 5f - Old Business - Klamath Watershed Coordination Group.**

Jim Carpenter presented a memorandum from the Klamath Watershed Coordination Group to Klamath River Task Force, Trinity River Task Force, The Klamath River Compact Commission, and the Hatfield Upper Basin Working Group regarding Cooperative Agreement approval dated June 11, 1999 (see Agendum 5f handout ). They are also working on a web site. Orcutt would like to see the fishing industry represented on the Coordination Group. Carpenter explained that this is not an action group and only coordinates the four groups. The Klamath Task Force needs to replace Troy Fletcher on the Coordination Group. The Coordination Group is to facilitate communications. Questions on the Cooperative Agreement should go to Bernice Sullivan. To better understand the Cooperative Agreement, Paul Kirk said we need to understand the makeup of the other groups and what they do.

**Public Comment**

Felice Pace - Many have encouraged increased coordination of restoration efforts as on the last agendum. Following are a few goals and objectives that would be very useful for the Task Force to consider:

We could look at the ecoregion strategy started by Fish and Wildlife Service.

There is potential for new salmon funds from the Salmon Initiative. We probably do not need more advisory committees for these.

The TMDL process may not happen, but some of the restoration work looks like regulatory compliance with the Clean Water Act. We should not to use taxpayer funds on private industrial timberlands for road rehabilitation, OK for road decommissioning.

Transportation planning and roads are a major policy issue and a local issue.

The Task Force can potentially put some of these issues on future agendas.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Staff will consider putting some of the issues mentioned by Felice Pace on the next agenda.

**Agendum 5g. Report on Fish Monitoring Efforts of Arcata FWO**

Bruce Halstead discussed results of 1999 juvenile salmonid monitoring season (see Agendum 5g handout). The outmigrant monitoring was funded by Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Task Force and the Trinity Task Force. They started monitoring of the Trinity on March 17<sup>th</sup> and started monitoring of the Klamath on April 11<sup>th</sup>. The numbers of young-of-year chinook were low until last week and then started to climb. The Trinity numbers include hatchery fish and we should get hatchery fish on the Klamath next week. On Figure 2 of the handout, there is an increase that is directly correlated with the size of fish. In the

Trinity River, coho will have a record year for outmigrants. In the Trinity, 97 percent are hatchery fish. In figure three, steelhead numbers have exceeded the 7-year average and 59 percent are naturally spawned in the Trinity River. The Klamath River has all natural fish, but there are not very many, Coho numbers in the Klamath River are well below average. There are ten times as many on the Trinity than in the Klamath (see Y scale), but there are the same number of fish on the two Rivers that are natural. 1989 through 1996 reports are available and 1997 and 1998 reports are in progress.

#### **Agendum 6. Clean Water Act TMDL process - how might this constrain nonpoint pollution? (John Hannum)**

This was canceled. A two-page description of nonpoint source pollution and a ASierra® article on the TMDL program were provided (see Agendum 6 handouts).

#### **Agendum 7. Status of Klamath Project and long-term EIS**

Jim Bryant, Bureau of Reclamation, described the Klamath Project situation. We have had 300 percent normal snowpack in the hills and plenty of water for the third year in a row. It is 40 percent above normal in the Williamson River. Inflow to Upper Klamath Lake is 1300 cfs, net and above normal. This has been a unique year. We have never had this late of snowpack. The Lake is not dropping as fast as it has in most years. The demand for irrigation is normal. The cool and dry Spring has triggered a dry operating scenario in the Summer. As far as the short-term EIS, we are waiting for a response from National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Flows below Iron Gate Dam are a little more than 1800 cfs.

Question from the Public -- Felice Pace -- There are problems with ramping flows and stranding of fish when the flows are at 1900 cfs or so. Are we having fluctuations or problems with standings? How will your process help avoid strandings?

Jim Bryant - 50 cfs of ramp per hour was decided to be the best for fish. Pacific Power and Light agreed to do this, but it is difficult to do. It was done and it is being monitored now. NMFS will have an RPA that requires a ramping study. We really don't know what ramping rates are best.

Belchik asked if there are plans for July operations? How many cfs are there to be released in July? Bryant replied 1300 cfs and Larry Dugan will be monitoring the effects.

Bernice Sullivan described the Klamath Project Long-term EIS process. There was a Long-term EIS meeting in Klamath Falls, OR, in May. The notices were sent out a little late. Most of the comments were already anticipated. Some thought it was a restoration EIS, but it is not. It covers operations. The schedule is unrealistic right now. There are unreasonable alternatives in some cases. The summary of the public meeting will go out to all on the mailing list. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Klamath Fishery Management Council, Trinity Task Force and Klamath Task Force is on the mailing list. The plans for the future are to have public meetings and workshops and present and discuss more with the public. Everyone is always welcome. A handout package was provided of all presentation/meeting materials (see Agendum 7 handouts).

#### **Agendum 8. Status of Funding Request for Klamath River Flow Study**

Engbring stated that the funding request was sent from the California/Nevada Operations Office to the Regional Office and then to the Fish and Wildlife Office in Washington, DC. This is the first time a funding request was sent for the Klamath Basin from Region 1. The request was for \$4.5 million in FY 2001 and per year for five consecutive years. The total is \$22.5 million. The request is in Washington, DC, and there is no way to control where it goes.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Staff is to provide a one-page Flow Study briefing to Herger and other congressional delegates.

#### **Agendum 9. Status of Department of Interior study efforts and their relation to Flow Study (Hardy)**

Dr. Thomas Hardy presented the status of the Department of Interior instream flow analysis (see Agendum 9 handout). On March 1, 1999, Phase I Draft was released and it is now being revised. It uses existing information to estimate minimum flows required for fisheries on the Klamath River. Phase II of the flow study has begun. We have had multiple coordination meetings with federal, state, local, tribal, and private organizations to achieve the following for Phase II:

- common field collection protocols
- common modeling approaches
- to establish specific study sites, not including the Tribes at this point. There are eight sites on the mainstem. The locations are on the attached map (see Agendum 9 handout)

3-D channel topographics at 7 of 8 sites mapped  
intensive fishery sampling at each site  
hydraulic modeling at one site

A Draft Report for Phase II will come out in late summer or early fall.

Joan Smith --Question-- What coordination have you done with the Counties? Hardy replied that for each coordination meeting, requests went out to Counties and local people were asked to get more people at the meetings. In the future, we will make sure all Counties are invited to the meetings.

### **Agendum 10. Mid-term Evaluation**

#### **Agendum 10a. 15 minute review from Pat Higgins**

Pat Higgins first asked if anyone had any questions and there were none. Dave Bitts wanted to go over the Key Issues. Laurie Simons suggested that we narrow the focus to the most important items from the Mid-term Evaluation and that we should consider as recommendations. John Engbring described the handouts. The first handout is the comment letter from the Yreka FWO on the Final Draft document. The second handout lists the five recommendations Bill Kier presented at the February Task Force meeting. The third handout is a selection of the recommendations from the report put together by Laurie Simons. The fourth handout is a selection of recommendations put together by Pat Higgins (see Agendum 10a handouts). Pat Higgins suggested the following items:

- adopt the amended recommendations
- adopt the CRMP plans in the Long Range Plan
- appoint a subcommittee to organize the recommendations
- in the Consensus Process - get training, be more pro-active and effective
- the Task Force confer with California Department of Forestry, and Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), concerning the need for improved stream protection; private land forestry and riparian ordinances
- make the Long Range Plan a Recovery Plan or go forward with the Sub-basin Plans so we don't have to do a Recovery Plan
- get more funding for monitoring from BOR so the restoration program funding is not used up
- seek funding for USFS for road decommissioning
- riparian easement - farmers and ranchers can get subsidies to not farm on the riparian zone and to keep cattle out for one time funding to farmers to protect the real estate and reduces run-off
- A forum should be formed to show programs that work
- the Sub-basin Plans are well organized. They will cut out most of the red tape
- hatcheries impact - economically no salmon are coming through Iron Gate. This we can control.
- Final Reports should be improved. The Fish and Wildlife Service should present a one-day training course.

Keith Wilkinson asked regarding the consensus process, if we were to get professional help, would we discontinue Robert's Rules of Order? Dave Bitts added what would the meeting style be? Wilkinson replied that we could possibly use a facilitator for sensitive issues before entrenchment. John Engbring included that we only implement some of Robert's Rules of Order, only motions and passing them. Engbring is responsible for keeping the meetings moving. Wilkinson suggested a round robin. The first person writes a proposal on a flip chart and others modify it until everyone is happy with it.

Joan Smith agreed with going to the State to get gauge funding. The County recommends acquisition of water rights. Many in the county are concerned with this. Pat Higgins told everyone that this is a free market concept and it is going on in the Central Valley. It is much better to conserve water across the board, but many need to do this too.

Kent Bulfinch suggested that we look at a study by Dr. Arron Douglas from NBS, an economic study. He is part of original IFIM study, and it is coming out this summer.

Bulfinch stated that the Long Range Plan (LRP) could become the Recovery Plan - another plan on top of the LRP would be destructive. We should clean up the LRP including Sub-basin Plans. The LRP does not cover all of the ESUs. We need to approach NMFS to see what we need to do to make it a Recovery Plan. Getting broader support is his number one recommendation. Engbring asked what is the schedule for the recovery plans? Don Reck replied that there is no hard schedule for the recovery plans. NMFS has stepped up efforts and he agrees that the LRP should be a component. It may not be as complete as a Recovery Plan. It needs to be tightened up, address sub-basins, and coordinate with the Northwest Forest Plan.

Engbring wanted to go through Bill Kier's five recommendations and see if there are things we can do.

Elwood Miller added that he sees a lot of overlap among the recommendations. Mike Orcutt wanted to know regarding the subcommittee oversight of the document, is that work done or could we get recommendations out of that group? Wilkinson answered that the RFP committee developed the proposal and Kier was selected as a proposer. Then Troy Fletcher was selected to set up an Oversight Committee. How should we deal with this now? We probably should appoint a committee to assess the steps that are to be taken. We need an endorsement from NMFS. Bulfinch added that we need to make a clean LRP and to set up a subcommittee to do it. Ronnie Pierce added that the LRP has a lot more recommendations in it than what is in the review. If we have a committee to come up with a list of changes to the LRP, a public notice would be required. Oversight Committee members will be Kent Bulfinch, Chair; Dave Bitts, Mike Belchik, Keith Wilkinson, and Ronnie Pierce. The charge of the Committee will be: 1) to look at the LRP recommendations and modify per the Mid-term Evaluation report; 2) look at the major recommendations in the Mid-term Evaluation and bring a set of those to the Task Force to be implemented; 3) to determine how the LRP could become a Recovery Plan with help from NMFS.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** The Task Force formed an Oversight Committee. The Committee was charged with: 1) looking at the Long Range Plan recommendations and modify them per Mid-term Evaluation Report and 2) look at major recommendations in the Mid-term Evaluation and bring a set if those to the Task Force to be implemented. Members: Kent Bulfinch, Chair; Mike Belchik, Dave Bitts, Ronnie Pierce, and Keith Wilkinson.

#### **Agendum 10b. Discuss distribution of Mid-term Evaluation report**

Who should receive it? Task Force, TWG, Klamath Fishery Management Council, Congressional staff, County Supervisors, Resource Conservation Districts, CRMPs, Sub-basin Planners, Irrigation Districts, and BOR representative, and Bernice Sullivan. The Yreka FWO staff will provide a list at the next meeting of people to whom it was sent to.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** The staff will prepare a list for the Task Force on the distribution of the Mid-term Evaluation Report. Some report recipients so far are: Task Force, TWG, Klamath Fishery Management Council, Congressional staff, County Supervisors, Resource Conservation Districts, CRMPs, Sub-basin Planners, Irrigation Districts, and BOR representative, and Bernice Sullivan.

#### **Agendum 11. Progress toward an organized community effort to secure more funding**

##### **Agendum 11a. Update on short- and medium-term funding needs (Fletcher)**

Dave Bitts - Essential fishery monitoring needs package was put together by KFMC. KFMC sent it to PSMFC and PCFFA (see Agendum 11a handouts).

A letter from PCFFA explaining the monitoring needs went to the President and Congress, but it is not in either the House or the Senate budgets. PCFFA will go back and ask again why it is not in FY 2000. Bitts added that the Interior budget and Reclamation budget are the budgets for it to go in. The Energy and Water Committee probably deleted it. We want it to be an annual request, or regular line item. Jeffy Davis-Marx asked what is the past funding source? Multiple sources, Bitts answered. Some are USFS, CDFG, but CDFG has been backing away.

##### **Agendum 11b. Update on long-term funding needs**

Bernice Sullivan presented a progress report of the Long-term Funding Subcommittee. A handout was provided outlining the funding needs to carry out all aspects of the Klamath Act (see Agendum 11b handout). The outline needs to be approved by the Task Force and KFMC. Ms. Sullivan provided overheads which estimated that needs for 2002- 2006 are \$7.5 million per year for a total of \$53.5 million. The needs included funds for restoration projects, monitoring and research, and others (planning, education, public outreach and coordination). Potential funding sources need to be identified further. The funding proposal is to be in Washington, DC, by April 2000.

Pierce asked if the Subcommittee talked about going beyond FY 2006? Sullivan replied no, they just focused on implementation of this Act. After this step, we will immediately have to work on re-authorization. Jim Depree mentioned the opportunities for the Task Force provided by Congress if they appropriate \$100 million per year for up to five years to the Salmon Initiative. The Senate subcommittee appropriation is \$80 million. The block grant would be for four states: Alaska, Washington, Oregon and California. The State Senate Bill 291 is being developed to spend a block grant \$25 million in federal funds with a \$25 million State match. The Republican party in Washington, DC, wants to make sure the money gets to the

ground. In California, the funds would be managed by the Resources Agency.

In five Counties, water agencies environmentalist groups are working to devise the funding process. There are three regional committees: north coast, central coast, and southern coast. Most of the money is going to the north coast. There is a technical committee and an advisory group made of major interest groups in each region. These groups would meet to prioritize and select projects for funding, then they would do a final ranking and send it to the State group, and then to the Secretary of Resources for a final selection. There is a lot of discussion, but nothing is concrete. The Task Force may want to get involved with this Aground up or top down approach. Engbring added that much of the process would duplicate what we do. Could this be reduced? We should think about it. The Tribes get ten percent allocated directly to them, plus can compete for other funding. This would be second year funding. Congress wants first year funding as soon as possible. Wilkinson said that this will not be a quick fix for long-term funding, we still need to pursue long-term funding. Engbring added that long-term funding should not go only through the Fish and Wildlife Service, its too big.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** The staff will draft a letter to the NMFS and the Resources Agency regarding capabilities of the Task Force within the Klamath Basin. Since 1986, the Task Force has ranked project proposals. A number of the proposals are still unfunded. This process will be a good tool to get projects on the ground. In the letter, the different groups will be identified are represented in the Task Force and groups that are advisory to the Task Force. Cc: Trinity Task Force.

Felice Pace made a public comment that there is high potential for mischief for this funding. Agriculture and timber are not represented on this Task Force, therefore, the Task Force is not complete. It will become political. A Memorandum of Understanding is critical as is a strategy for the Sub-basin Plans. Six new committees will generate for potential confusion and a waste of money. The Task Force could reach a consensus and weigh in on this process. The Task Force has experience that could help the Resources Agency and NMFS. I would like to see a letter from the Task Force saying that they would calculate the number of salmonid stream miles, general statements about a clean process, mention on that some proponents are not in the decision-making loop, and take positions on this if you can get a consensus.

Paul Kirk talked about the Five Counties Group. They are working on the road systems with NMFS. Mark Lancaster is the coordinator working with the Counties. The Task Force needs to have input on the package from the Five Counties Group.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Add to the next agenda Paul Kirk's recommendation to invite Mark Lancaster, Multi-County Coordinator, to bring to light of the five county process. Paul Kirk will ask Mark Lancaster to come to the next meeting.

Wilkinson mentioned that with Troy Fletcher leaving there will be no Task Force representative on the Long-term Funding Subcommittee. Wilkinson represents KFMC on long-term funding. Troy has not been able to participate so far. The schedule is to try to get an appropriation by October. Pierce said that we do want to continue working on long-term funding. Lets get another Task Force member on the committee. Orcutt wanted to see other ways to get funds and not just an amendment. Mary Ellen Mueller could not support the three-year action plan on the Trinity and that was much more fleshed out. We need much more justification developed. Wilkinson added we are open on other funding sources and wants to develop the proposal much more. Anybody can provide input to the committee at any time. Belchik said that the flow study was not included. We are going for separate funding and it is not in the current Klamath Act. Smith stated if we are modifying the Act, do it in the re-authorization process. This will take a few years. Higgins added that long-term funding should be pursued, mesh it with the Salmon Initiative. Pace answered a question on whether we can increase funding in appropriations without amending the authorization, yes, it has been done, examples include Riders Appropriation Bills. It was agreed that the Long-term Funding Subcommittee should continue pursuing the Long-term Funding proposal. Also, that Keith Wilkinson will represent Task Force and ask the Klamath Fishery Management Council if Troy Fletcher can be the representative for the Council.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** The Task Force wants the Long-term Funding Subcommittee to continue working on their proposal. Keith Wilkinson will represent the Task Force. The Task Force will ask the Klamath Fishery Management Council if Troy Fletcher can be the representative for the Council.

**5:00 - 7:00**      **Social Hour - no host bar and get together - in Klamath Room**



**FINAL MINUTES**

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
June 24, 1999  
Shilo Inn  
KLAMATH Falls, Oregon**

June 24, 1999

8:00AM

Reconvene

**Members present**

**Representative Seat**

Mike Belchik	Yurok Tribe
David Bitts	Task Force Vice-Chair and California Salmon Fishing Industry
Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
John Engbring	Task Force Chair and Department of the Interior
Chris Erikson	Trinity County
Paul Kirk	Humboldt County
Elwood Miller, Jr.	Klamath Tribe
Julie Perrochet	Alternate for U.S. Department of Agriculture
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ronnie Pierce	Alternate for Karuk Tribe
Don Reck	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mike Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
Don Russell	Klamath County
Joan T. Smith	Siskiyou County
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

After clarifying points from the day before, the Task Force shared a birthday cake for Mike Rode. He had to leave early that day.

**Agendum 12. Reports from Sub-basin Planning groups on progress of Sub-basin Planning and restoration efforts and future proposed work**

**Agendum 12a. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Mike Polmateer)**

Mike Polmateer, Mid-Klamath Sub-basin Coordinator, was hired by the Karuk Tribe of California in June 1997 to work on the Sub-basin Action Plan. The Mid-Klamath coordination effort addresses three areas: 1) education, 2) communication, and 3) restoration (see Agendum 12a handout). The first area is primarily directed at the public school system. The Klamath River studies were approved by the Task Force in 1989. The goal for FY 2000 is to introduce teachers, Kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grades, of fishery restoration. It is called the GLOBE Program. It teaches students to take environmental measurements and teaches about Adopt-a-Watershed program.

Restoration work being completed is done according to the Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual. It is primarily a reference document and provides an easy approach to fishery restoration. Mike Polmateer drafted the Sub-basin Plan with the help of Bob Rohde. The Plan addresses twelve key watersheds in the middle Klamath sub-basin. Coordination efforts are in place with the Forest Service on decommissioning of roads. Training is being given to 40 tribal members on how to decommission the roads. Now, the Tribe needs funding for the restoration.

Questions - Don Russell asked if they have a shining program that is getting a bigger bang for our buck. Polmateer replies that the education portion is probably the best. Rode asked if a lot of that work is done by the Siskiyou County Schools? Polmateer replies, yes, but not basin-wide. Rode asked what about baseline matrix - how will it be used? Polmateer could not answer the question at this time. He has received very few comments back on the Draft Plan. Rode commented that there are a lot of data gaps. Polmateer replied yes, and he will be working closely with the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation to fill them in. The Forest Service does watershed analysis well and he can take that information back with him. Julie Perrochet commented that Al Olson has prioritized the watersheds and asks that this plan be worked into Al's

work. Polmateer agrees and he is talking with Al.

#### **Agendum 12b. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb)**

Dave Webb, Shasta River Sub-basin Coordinator, has been the Coordinator since 1991. Webb provided four handouts. He presented a slide show of projects of the Shasta Valley, including livestock exclusion fencing, alternative watering systems, and educational efforts. He provided a handout of restoration projects in the Shasta Valley over the years. He discussed the larger issues of the Shasta Valley such as irrigation tail water reuse. A team has been established to prioritize problems in the Shasta River for anadromous fish. He provided two handouts that described their priorities and strategic planning. It has been difficult to prioritize because basic studies have not been done. They will rely on their best professional judgement. He also provided a proposal that was submitted this year that emphasized data gathering needs of the Valley (see Agendum 12b handouts). Smith thanked Webb for a good presentation.

#### **Agendum 12c. Salmon River Sub-basin (Peter Brucker and Don Elder)**

An outline of the Salmon River Sub-basin Restoration Strategy was provided (see Agendum 12c handout). Don Elder, Geologist, from the Klamath National Forest, discussed how they are working on developing the restoration strategy and Action Plan. He explained that they will be drawing on assessments from larger and smaller scale studies for the Forest Service. The watershed prioritization will address the upslope environment, fuels environment, and aquatic environment.

Peter Brucker, Sub-basin Planning Coordinator for the Salmon River Restoration Council (SRRC), has been the Coordinator since 1992. He discussed the Action Plan for the Restoration Council. The SRRC is made up of educators, cooperators, stakeholders, USFS, Karuk Tribe, and others. There are only 300 people in the watershed on 2 million acres. Four thousand volunteer person days are dedicated to do training, education, and getting schools involved. The highlights are on working with steelhead and fall chinook for which 12 weeks out of the year volunteers surveyed eight reaches. Brucker discussed the problems with noxious weeds such as spotted knapweed and their aggressive attempts to rid of it. He fears that it will invade restored sites. River bars have these plants and some people want to treat them with herbicides, but the community prefers other treatments. They are approaching the problem by educating the people about it. Several handouts were provided on educational efforts to address noxious weeds (see Agendum 12c handouts). The SRRC is strong on fish protection, however, fire is a huge problem. In 1996, 55,000 acres were burned intensely and more in 1997.

#### **Agendum 12d. Scott River Sub-basin (Jeffy Davis-Marx)**

Jeffy Davis-Marx, Scott River Sub-basin Coordinator, works with the Scott River Watershed CRMP and the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District. The focus of the CRMP committee is to increase an interest base of restoration efforts. Davis-Marx supplied copies of various Plans (see Agendum 12d handout). The first Plan was the Fall Flows Action Plan. The Plan has been updated several times. Other Plans were the Fish Habitat Plan, Upland Management Plan, and the Five-year Action Plan. Davis-Marx asked how do we decide what is the most important to do now? The Sub-basin Action Plan will pull all the information together that would be beneficial. Davis-Marx submitted a proposal for completing the Action Plan, but it was not funded. She also explained that she needs the help of professionals in pulling the data together. She told the TWG one and a half years ago that she would start the Action Plan, but the smaller Plans are not getting approved by the CRMP. Riparian planting techniques have evolved over the years. It looks like trench planting with long cuttings works best.

Davis-Marx facilitates the Shackleford Mill Watershed landowner and several other local group meetings. Eighteen fish screens were sought for funding. Six or seven students built small screens and there are three larger screens. National Marine Fisheries Service could help streamline the process for approving screen designs. Flows continue to be a bone of contention. Alternate stock water systems will save 10.3 cfs to the stream after August 15<sup>th</sup>. The Water Conservation Project saves 3 inches per acre and there is increasing landowner participation. It is difficult to address the flow issue. They are working on the efficiency of irrigation systems. There are 130+ diversions in the Scott Valley.

Questions - Dave Bitts asked if the CDFG's screen shop is helping with screen designs? Davis-Marx replies that according to Lorrie Bundy, they have gotten help with screen designs from the CDFG and also from Natural Resources Conservation Service. Joan Smith commented that Davis-Marx is doing a good job, but she is concerned about consensus issues and if there is a member that is causing problems then that person should be removed and another member should step in to get a fresh perspective. Davis-Marx answered by saying, yes, they had two facilitated special meetings. The organization will not change representation. They could do a retreat, but she is hesitant to spend more money. The last meeting was a good meeting. Davis-Marx continued that fish screening is the most important part of their effort because screens have an immediate impact of saving fish. Mike Orcutt asked if there are any efforts to update the 97 Working Plan? There is no section on harvesting or

poaching. The Plan gives a taint that the problems are only with the Indian fishery. They may need to consult with the Yurok Tribe to improve that section. Some policy statements are not accurate.

#### **Agendum 12e. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Mike Belchik for Jim Bond)**

Mike Belchik discussed the lower Klamath sub-basin and provided a handout (see Agendum 12e handout) He stated that eighty percent of the Yurok Reservation is owned by Simpson Timber Company. The reservation extends one mile on each side of the Klamath River. There are sediment problems in the Klamath River due to poor land management. The species of concern are late fall run chinook, steelhead, coho, and coastal cutthroat trout. The planning group consists of a partnership between the Yurok Tribe and Simpson Timber Company and is mediated by the California Coastal Commission. Early on, Simpson said road systems are off limits and now Simpson has allowed the Tribe full access to evaluate conditions and possible decommissioning of roads. The Task Force has provided the seed money to generate productive partnerships. Belchik provided a handout that shows prioritized watersheds in a table. The Watershed Restoration Division was founded to do watershed planning inventory. The program is now getting \$5 million per year. The entire watershed has been surveyed. They identified the highest priorities and cost effective projects to reduce sediment input into the River and they are moving down the list with projects. There is a need for crews and equipment to do the work. The Tribe has implemented a large scale training program showing how to operate excavation on erodible geology. So far, 18 tribal members have been through the training. This includes a six-week classroom and field session, a 14-week internship and then they graduate with a certificate. The program has prevented 82,000 cubic yards of sediment from entering the River by hydrological decommissioning or rehabilitation of roads. The in-kind contributors are Simpson Timber Company and others listed on the handout. The 1999 projects were McGarvey Creek, Ah Pah, Tectah, and Lower Blue Creek inventories.

Questions - John Engbring noticed the Sub-basin efforts are focusing on road rehabilitation. He then asked if Simpson Timber Company utilizes buffers during logging practices. Belchik understood that Simpson logs under CDFG rules and they are working on a large scale Habitat Conservation Plan. Belchik does not know about their logging practices specifically. Engbring commented that CDFG's rules and regulations are not adequate for protecting salmon. Roads are just one part of protecting salmon. Belchik agreed that it is just one part of the total package. Paul Kirk added that Simpson has taken the lead in working with others on restoration. Belchik said that there are 15 teams doing on-the-ground excavation and seven inventory teams. In response to Russell, Belchik said the training program is probably their greatest effort because it has led to a real increase in work being done.

Joan Smith asked if the partnership is a CRMP. Belchik said it is the Lower Klamath Restoration Program, not a CRMP. They decided to focus on roads and sediment with the major landowner. Mike Orcutt asked what protection of the restoration investments are being made? Belchik replied that there is a negotiation process on which roads are surplus.

#### **Agendum 13. TF review of Sub-basin Plans - Shasta Watershed Restoration Plan example and Agendum 14. Criteria for Sub-basin Planning group performance - Final Report contents for next year**

Engbring asked if there were questions from the Task Force on Sub-basin Reports - Mike Orcutt heard that it would be good to have consistent criteria for all the groups. He would like to see someone put together what is working where. Engbring added that there is a need to have a format for the Sub-basin Plans and reporting requirements at the end of each year. Julie Perrochet said that each group has a slightly different focus and that their issues are different. Orcutt agrees. Bulfinch said that the format for the Sub-basin Plans is confusing and is not in layman's language. The interest groups and the people impacted by the fish population decline need to be described, then all need to provide a plan for addressing causative factors, and set goals with time lines. Bulfinch provided a handout of six factors needed in the Sub-basin Plans (see Agendum 14 handout). Bulfinch said we need more interaction with the Sub-basin Groups, maybe more often than annually to bring them into the TWG. Belchik agreed that getting the Sub-basin Groups involved with the TWG will help to increase communications. The TWG is talking with the Shasta CRMP and pulling together goals and objectives. He sees better proposals out of the Shasta CRMP already. We need to reaffirm this process of working together more.

Dave Bitts said that the Task Force is a bit behind the Sub-basin Groups. We have an Action Plan outline approved and a new outline from Kent Bulfinch. We have some Action Plans done. Engbring recalled that the Action Plans are not all done. Shasta has all the parts. Bitts agrees.

Pat Higgins provided a handout on Adaptive Management (see Agendum 14 handout). It describes a system of testing hypotheses that guide priorities for funding. The Long Range Plan is not sufficiently detailed to guide actions. Jim Depree remarked on the individual nature of the efforts in the watersheds. They are not one size fits all. How can we allow for the differences?

Bitts stated that they need to review and comment on the Sub-basin Plans to try to get them to a format that could become a Recovery Plan. Davis-Marx said that the outline came from the Sub-basin Groups and TWG meetings to get it together. The Sub-basin Groups are working with Yvonne Everett on common issues in a planning effort. She always writes up a report. Engbring asked what is the status of the Sub-basin Plans? The Group replied, Salmon River draft is due in October; Shasta had a draft plan and will continually revise it; mid-Klamath has a general draft; the Scott has separate elements of a plan; and the Lower Klamath will have a draft this month. James Wroble said that the TWG has been working hard on the flow study effort and Humboldt State University's professors are helping with the planning and prioritization, not just GIS, but actual planning. The plans need to identify core problems and be able to address them.

Joan Smith read the Mission Statement of the Sub-basin Groups. She understood that they are all working together. There is a balance. We are working with volunteers. Higgins' example is very scientific, but we don't have money to hire scientists. There needs to be a sensitive balance, not top down and not so strict that we drive people away. Peter Brucker discussed monitoring the groups by reporting at the end of the year may help and may increase some consistency among the groups. The Task Force needs to make sure the reports have what wants to be seen.

Engbring recapped that the Task Force-approved Action Plan outline will be used loosely to guide Plans and Sub-basin Groups will get the TWG's help to add the science to help develop the Plans.

**\*\* Assignment \*\*** The Task Force Chair has asked the TWG to assist the Sub-basin Planning Coordinators in the development and implementation of the Sub-basin Plans. The Task Force-approved Sub-basin Action Plan Outline shall be used as a flexible outline in the development of these plans. TWG assistance will provide additional scientific expertise to this effort.

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** The staff will incorporate Kent Bulfinch's six points and provide a Final Report Outline no later than the February meeting to the Sub-basin Planning Coordinators for use in reporting next June.

Dave Webb said that he is hesitant to call the outline the bottom effort for Action Plans. It is not useful to use with constituents. Engbring felt that there is enough flexibility in working with the TWG and to use the outline more loosely as guidance. Perrochet added to make sure Sub-basin Plans need to provide for Recovery Plan and TMDL needs. Al Olson has some points needing consideration. Engbring said that these points should be taken by the TWG when working with the Sub-basin Groups. We can put this in with Bulfinch's points.

#### **Agendum 15. TWG Report: FY2000 Proposal Ranking and Workplan recommendations (Wroble)**

James Wroble was elected as the new TWG Chair at the June meeting. Wroble stated that the prior Chair, Mike Belchik, did a huge job especially getting everybody through the development of the flow study components. The group learned a lot together and became a cohesive group. Thank you for your work, Mike. The group applauded.

At the June meeting, the TWG ranked all of the FY 2000 proposals for funding (see Agendum 15 handout - table of ranked projects). Wroble discussed the ranking and talked about the technical process, set of criteria, and went over the categories. More than five proposals in planning (Category 2) were received, yet the Task Force had decided to fund only the Sub-basin Groups. Not sure what to do about this, the TWG still ranked all of Category 2 projects. There were 54 project proposals. There are two positions on the TWG that are not assigned, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and Commercial Fisheries. Keith Wilkinson is concerned that the Technical Advisory Team's input was not taken. Wilkinson stated that in Category 3, there were at least two critical components that fall well below the funding cutoff. Belchik addressed this by saying the Technical Advisory Team provided input on the harvest monitoring proposals. The figures were all so close, but the problem is funding shortfalls. Bitts asked don't we already know about the effects of elevated temperatures? Why did they rank so high? Wroble replied that this is a focused study. Most of the information on temperature effects is from studies up north, but fish in California may be different from fish in British Columbia, for example. We need this information.

Bulfinch explained the proposal selection process. They are ranked in categories, and the Budget Committee decides how much to spend in each category beforehand. These figures are provided in a handout. We simply fund projects according to TWG priorities. Partially funded projects are thrown together and the highest ranked ones are funded. Wilkinson is concerned with the Category 3 ranking. This is the 10<sup>th</sup> year he has defended the KFMC for whatever reason. The KFMC has tried to separate funds from the rest of the funds and has not been successful. They are faced with losing the continuity of data. No solutions have been implemented. Wroble discussed the procedures and said that the TWG doesn't vote on their own projects. This keeps the integrity of the ranking process. Wilkinson said he was not questioning the TWG's integrity, but would like to adjust priorities, that was why he pushed for the Technical Advisory Team's input that failed. Belchik answered by saying that the TWG would benefit if Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and the Commercial Fishing Industry had

representatives at the meeting instead of a conference call. Wilkinson responded by saying that ODFW has had a difficult time in getting representation because most of the issues are not Oregon issues. This is an annual problem.

Orcutt requested a discussion of what is agreed on. Category 1 funding goes down to E-04 on the list, the Hoopa Tribe could take \$4,000 less; Category 2 is divided equally among the five groups, and Category 3 is the last item.

Bitts saw a number of educational projects. What about E-05? Why was it ranked higher? What's the project? Harry Carlson explained the rationale for the TWG rankings. He said that its not a consensus, its individual votes which will get ten different answers. Ronnie Pierce asked Ron Iverson in some years back if there was a problem with the Fish and Wildlife Service having an independent body making the video. Iverson replied that the problem could remain. Any video has to pass a review above us at different stages of development. We will look into it. Don Reck commented that it is kind of late for finding out about this kind of problem, maybe not fund it. Alice Kilham commented that the Bureau of Reclamation has already funded this project. Belchik added that this proposer has already done Pyramid Lake and Truckee River and they have lots of experience.

Wilkinson commented that in Category 3, FP-03 and FP-07 needs to be funded to meet KFMC needs, approximately \$45,000. Belchik stated that FP-15 was ranked higher by the TWG. Smith commented that HSU would not accept \$40,000 in part if they do not accept \$37,000. HSU funding should go to Category 2. The study by Mike Deas should be funded too, HP-07. Orcutt asked 1) if FP-07 has ever been funded by BOR? and 2) in FY2000, has it been proposed to BOR for funding? Bruce Halstead stated that, no, BOR has not funded this.

Engbring requested a consensus that the proposals be funded up to FP-09 and offer the rest to PC-11. Orcutt felt that the Task Force needs to look at the bang for the buck. Both of Wilkinson's projects fit into stock protection, and Bogus Creek may be quite important.

Bitts requested that we manipulate Category 3 to read FP-07, FP-03, HP-06, and FP-15 be funded for a total of \$75,000. We need to defer FP-06 and reduce FP-02 and FP-09 funding and hope Arcata could have BOR fund it. Smith commented that some of these projects are critical and her question is what projects are truly critical. What happens if its not funded? Bitts answered that if the studies are not done, fisheries will be closed. Bitts proposed the following projects be funded in Category 3. They were shown on a flip chart:

PC-02	Shasta Dams	\$40.3
FP-15	Bogus Creek	\$15.1
HP-06	Seiad Gauge	\$15.0
FP-03	Age Comp	\$15.4
HP-09	Shasta Gauge	\$7.6
FP-07	Mainstem Spawn	\$30.0
FP-02	SIAM	\$31.8
FP-09	Screw Traps	\$48.2
FP-06	Health and Physiological effects of elevated water temps on juvenile steelhead	\$16.0
FP-07	Mainstem Klamath River	\$30.0
	Fall Chinook Spawning Escapement	
Total		\$194.0

Engbring asked Halstead if Arcata could make up a \$23,000 shortfall in FP-02 or FP-09? Halstead replied that BOR is not here to answer that, but they have funded screw trap shortfalls in the past. Perrochet suggested to fund FP-02 in full and fund half of FP-09 would make sense. Orcutt doesn't feel that this monitoring information is critical. Bitts replied that this information is important to the mega table. Orcutt thinks that FP-01 may be even more important. Smith proposed to throw out HP-09, but would hate to lose the continuous monitoring. Perrochet said that the Forest Service has paid for the Seiad gauge in the past, but can no longer carry the gauge. Bitts agrees with Smith. Orcutt recommends continuing advocating to BOR for money.

Bitts discussed the Shasta gauge, the \$7,600 item. He agreed its critical and requests it be put on this list. Can Halstead get \$30,000 from BOR? We could then include HP-09. Pierce asked what happens if NMFS funds FP-03? Kirk answered then the screw traps, FP-09, would be more fully funded.

The group developed the following motion:

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Bitts)** In Category 3, projects on the flip chart shall be funded as indicated in priority order. (PC-02, FP-15, HP-06, FP-03, FP-07, FP-02, FP-09, FP-06 and HP-07). We expect the Fish and Wildlife Service to seek funding for the shortfall from Bureau of Reclamation for FP-09. However, should another project get funded by another source, FP-09 shall be more fully funded. If there is additional project money available from prior years, FP-09 shall be more fully funded. If there is additional project money available after fully funding FP-09, then FP-06 would be funded. If there is additional project money available after fully funding FP-09 and FP-06, then HP-07 would be funded.

**\*\*Second\*\* (Kirk)**

**\*\*Motion Passes\*\* Abstain: Bulfinch, Wilkinson and Belchik** Bulfinch's abstention is based on his discomfort with the lack of Commerce funding. Reck also sees that Department of Interior, USFS, and CDFG are not funded evenly. Wilkinson abstained because a family member is involved with some of the proposals. Belchik abstained because he was involved with the TWG ranking.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Elwood)** In Category 1, approve funding down to E-04 with the stipulation that the Hoopa Tribe accepted the reduction in funding for E-04 to about \$34,000.

**\*\*Second\*\* (Russell)**

**\*\*Motion Passes\*\* Abstain: Wilkinson and Belchik** Wilkinson abstained because a family member is involved with some of the proposals. Belchik abstained because he was involved with the TWG ranking.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Kirk)** In Category 2, funding shall be equally divided among the Sub-basin Planning Groups.

**\*\*Second\*\* (Bitts)**

**\*\*Motion Passes\*\* Abstain: Wilkinson and Belchik** Wilkinson abstained because a family member is involved with some of the proposals. Belchik abstained because he was involved with the TWG ranking.

Belchik suggested that for the future, that the Task Force discuss not putting planning projects in Category 2 because that funding is now redelegated to sub-basin groups only. Dave Webb commented that the west coast will be deficient in funding studies. There are other funding sources for on-the-ground projects. He suggested that the Task Force fund studies more. The Budget Committee should discuss this.

#### **Agendum 16. Recap and summary of assignments and motions (Simons)**

Laurie Simons passed out a handout that summarizes the assignments and motions, then went over them. The Task Force offered some minor edits (they are incorporated). Agenda for the next meeting should include: the Task Force would like to hear more about the coordinating groups, Five Counties Group, long-range funding committee, TWG report, Bingham awards, field trip on the afternoon of the first day, and whether we want to have a retreat.

**Adjourn**

***LIST OF ATTENDEES  
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
June 23-24, 1999  
Shilo Inn  
Klamath Falls, Oregon***

**The following Task Force members attended the meeting:**

<b><u>Members present</u></b>	<b><u>Representative Seat</u></b>
Mike Belchik	Yurok Tribe
David Bitts	Task Force Vice-Chair and California Salmon Fishing Industry
Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
John Engbring	Task Force Chair and Department of the Interior
Chris Erikson	Trinity County
Paul Kirk	Humboldt County
Elwood Miller, Jr.	Klamath Tribe
Al Olson	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Julie Perrochet	Alternate for Al Olson
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ronnie Pierce	Alternate for Karuk Tribe
Mike Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
Don Russell	Klamath County
Joan T. Smith	Siskiyou County
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

**The individuals listed below also attended the meeting**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Organization</u></b>
Ron Iverson	FWS
Steve Lewis	FWS
James R. Ottoman	Private citizen
Ken Rykbost	Oregon State University
Jim Carpenter	Hatfield Group
Randall Seelbrede	Natural Resources
Bruce Halstead	FWS
Mary Ellen Mueller	FWS
Bernice Sullivan	BOR
Doug Tedrick	BIA
Earl Danosky	Tulelake I.D.
James Wroble	Hoopa Tribe
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County
Felice Pace	KFA
Sandy Maunz	KFA
Jim Bryant	USBR
Sue Mattenberger	FWS
Tessa Stuedli	KWUA
Don Maussandt	Private citizen
Alice Kilham	Klamath River Compact
Steve Kirk	Oregon DEQ
Richard Ford	USFS
Steve West	Klamath County
Pat Higgins	Kier Associates
Miller Anderson, Sr.	Private citizen
Dr. Thom Hardy	Utah State
Alice Kilham	Klamath Compact Commission
Jeffy Davis-Marx	Scott CRMP

Dave Webb	Shasta CRMP
Mike Polmateer	Karuk Tribe
Pete Brucker	Salmon River Restoration Council
Don Elder	US Forest Service
Laurie Simons	FWS
Darla Eastman	FWS
Beverly Wesemann	FWS
Dave Hill	FWS



**FINAL AGENDA**  
**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE**  
**MEETING**  
**June 23-24, 1999**  
**Shilo Inn**  
**Klamath Falls, Oregon**

June 23, 1999

- 9:00 AM      1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, chair and Dave Bitts, vice chair.
2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance
3. Business
- a. Adoption of agenda
- b. Adoption of minutes from February 1999 meeting
- c. Express gratitude to Shasta and Scott CRMP coordinators for helping out with field visits for Siskiyou Daily News and NCRWQCB 319h rep
4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Simons)
5. Old business
- a. Status of letter to Secretary Babbitt on administrative costs (Pierce)
- b. FY2000 budget as approved at last meeting
- c. Status of appointment letters/charter
- d. Status of funding for Klamath flow gauges (Rode)
- e. Draft letter from the Task Force to Klamath National Forest expressing the importance of the fishery data they have collected over the years.
- f. Klamath Watershed Coordination Group Cooperative Agreement
- g. Report on Fish Monitoring Efforts of Aracta FWO
6. Clean Water Act TMDL Process (Canceled)
7. Status of Klamath Project and long-term EIS (Bryant)
8. Status of Klamath River Flow Study (Engbring)
9. Status of Department of Interior study efforts and their relation to Flow Study (Hardy)
10. Mid-term Evaluation
- a. 15 minute review from Pat Higgins
- b. Discuss dissemination of report
- c. TF discussion of main recommendations - where do we go from here?
11. Progress toward an organized community effort to secure more funding
- a. Update on short- and medium-term funding needs
- b. Update on long-term funding needs (Bernice Sullivan)

5:00      Recess

5:00 - 7:00      Social Hour - open bar and get together - in Klamath Room

June 24, 1999

- 8:00      12. Reports from Sub-basin Planning groups on progress of sub-basin planning and restoration efforts and future proposed work
- a. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Mike Polmateer)

- b. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb)
- c. Salmon River Sub-basin (Peter Brucker and Don Elder)
- d. Scott River Sub-basin (Jeffy Davis-Marx)
- e. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Mike Belchik for Jim Bond)

- 13. TF review of Sub-basin plans - Shasta Watershed Restoration Plan example
  - a. Short summary of the plan by Dave Webb
  - b. TF discussion
- 14. Criteria for Sub-basin Planning group performance - Final Report contents for next year
- 15. TWG Report: FY2000 Proposal Ranking and Workplan recommendations (Wroble)
  - a. TF discussion
  - b. Public comment
  - c. TF decision on FY2000 Workplan
- 16. Recap and summary of assignments and motions (Simons)

Adjourn

**LIST OF HANDOUTS**  
**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE**  
**MEETING**  
**June 23-24, 1999**  
**Shilo Inn**

**Klamath Falls, Oregon**

Agendum 4 Handout	Memorandum from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Regional Director, dated February 22, 1999, regarding Conservation Grants Proposed in the FY 2000 Budget
Agendum 4 Handout	Letter to All Interest Parties inviting proposals for the Klamath Restoration Program dated March 4, 1999
Agendum 4 Handout	Letter to CRMPs and Sub-basin Planning Groups dated March 8, 1999, concerning the TF decision to equally fund all sub-basins
Agendum 4 Handout	Letter from Mike Spear responding to Wally Herger's letter dated March 16, 1999
Agendum 4 Handout	Letter from Fred Keeley, Assembly California Legislature, to the Task Force, dated April 8, 1999, requesting consideration of support for the Watershed, Wildlife, and Parks Improvement Bond Act of 2000
Agendum 4 Handout	Example of appointment letters to Budget Committee dated May 3, 1999
Agendum 4 Handout	Example of requests for appointment to the Task Force Membership dated May 5, 1999
Agendum 4 Handout	Letter from Task Force to Secretary Babbitt dated May 5, 1999, requesting funding for Klamath gauges and monitoring
Agendum 4 Handout	FY 1999 Klamath River Basin Restoration Projects administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Agendum 5a Handout	Draft Letter from Mr. David Bitts, Vice-Chairman KRBFTF, to Honorable Bruce Babbitt; regarding DOI administrative funding for the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Act; dated June 24, 1999
Agendum 5b Handout	Budget Allocation Totals for FY 2000
Agendum 5c Handout	Charter - Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
Agendum 5d Handout	Email message from Mike Rode to Bill Bennett, DWR, dated March 3, 1999, discussing limited funding of Klamath flow gauges
Agendum 5e Handout	Draft Letter from John Engbring, Chairman-Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, to Michael Lee, Acting USDA Forest Supervisor; draft letter
Agendum 5f Handout	Memo from the Klamath Watershed Coordination Group to Klamath River Fisheries Task Force, Trinity Basin River Fish & Wildlife Task Force, The Klamath River Compact Commission, and the The Hatfield Upper Basin Working Group; regarding Cooperative Agreement Approval (Cooperative Agreement attached); dated June 11, 1999
Agendum 5g Handout	Klamath River Basin Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring Program - A Report Update for the 1999 Monitoring Season by the Arcata Fish & wildlife Office; dated June 18, 1999
Agendum 6 Handout	EPA Nonpoint Pointers - Pointer No. 6 - Managing Nonpoint Source Pollution from Agriculture
Agendum 6 Handout	Sierra Magazine article, AThe Clean Water Clause®

Agendum 7 Handout	Information on environmental scoping for Long Term Operations Plan for the Klamath Project
Agendum 9 Handout	Department of Interior Flow Study Status from Utah State University
Agendum 10a Handout	Letter from John Engbring to William Kier Associates dated March 26, 1999, regarding the review of Final Draft of the Mid-term Evaluation of Restoration Program
Agendum 10a Handout	Letter from Karuk Tribe to Laurie Simons, FWS, dated March 26, 1999, regarding their review of Mid-Term Evaluation
Agendum 10a Handout	Key Issues from the Mid-Term Evaluation
Agendum 10a Handout	Bill Kier's Five Most Important Recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation
Agendum 10a Handout	A Selection of Recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Program
Agendum 11a Handout	Letter from Klamath Fishery Management Council to Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission dated March 15, 1999, regarding funding needs for monitoring
Agendum 11a Handout	Letter from Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations to President Clinton dated March 12, 1999, regarding Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery
Agendum 11b Handout	Copies of Overheads on Long Term Funding Proposal for Klamath River Basin Fishery Resources Restoration Act of 1989-2006 (Klamath Act)
Agendum 12a Handout	Mid-Klamath Coordinator Report to Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force - June 24, 1999
Agendum 12b Handout	Shasta CRMP - Limiting Factor Prioritization
Agendum 12b Handout	Decade Report - Restoration in the Shasta Valley
Agendum 12b Handout	Klamath River Fishery Restoration Program - Fiscal Year 2000 - Project Summary Sheet
Agendum 12b Handout	CRMP Meeting Focus: Strategic Planning for the next 5 years
Agendum 12c Handout	Salmon River Sub-basin Restoration Strategy Document Outline-Draft
Agendum 12c Handout	Prevention of Noxious Weeds
Agendum 12d Handout	Scott River Watershed CRMP Council Document
Agendum 12e Handout	Yurok Tribe's/LKRP's Watershed Restoration Program
Agendum 13 Handout	Motion regarding the subbasin action plan outline from the Final Minutes for the Klamath Task Force Meeting on October 15-16, 1997 in Ashland , Oregon
Agendum 13 Handout	Excerpts from: Draft Template for an Adaptive Management Planning Document Example Watershed: Stanislaus River - produced by Carl Mesick/USFWS-Anadromous Fish Restoration Program; dated March 1999
Agendum 13 Handout	Notes on Sub-basin Action Groups (CRMPs) from Kent Bulfinch
Agendum 14 Handout	Draft Klamath Sub-basin Report Outline

Agendum 15 Handout      Final FY2000 List of Ranked Proposals

Agendum 15 Handout      Definitions of Funding Categories

Informational Handouts:

News article, Siskiyou Daily News, April 30, 1999

News article, Siskiyou Daily News, May 21, 1999

News article, San Francisco Chronicle, June 21, 1999

**ASSIGNMENTS AND MOTIONS**  
**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE**  
**MEETING**  
**June 23-24, 1999**  
**Shilo Inn**  
**Klamath Falls, Oregon**

**Assignments:**

- Agendum 3b      Correction to Minutes - Wilkinson asked that PFMC be changed to PSMFC on page 16, third paragraph of the February meeting minutes.
- Agendum 5a      John Engbring will ask Mary Ellen Mueller to review the draft letter by Ronnie Pierce to Secretary Babbitt on administrative costs. Engbring will discuss any recommended changes with Bitts and Pierce before sending the letter. Engbring will take the letter to the Solicitor's Office for an opinion.
- Agendum 5d      Task Force Chair assigned the Technical Work Group to report on stream gauges in the Klamath Basin looking at historical and current funding sources, if available, and include USGS expertise, to the extent possible. Where gauges are needed, identify what information is needed to produce the information, including the costs. Also in the report, the TWG will: 1) include a discussion of telemonitoring and appropriate water quality parameters to monitor, 2) examine existing data and make sure any newly designed gauges would collect the appropriate data, and 3) identify any additional gauge monitoring that would be needed. The TWG needs to identify any redundancies. The TWG will provide a handout to Yreka FWO two weeks before the October meeting.
- Agendum 5e      Staff will send out draft letter from the Task Force to Brad Powell, Department of Agriculture, expressing the importance of the fishery data the Forest Service has collected over the years and to request continuing funding. Cc: Six Rivers National Forest and the Klamath National Forest.
- Agendum 5e      Staff will ensure that the Klamath Tribe is on the letterhead used for any Task Force correspondence.
- Agendum 5f      Staff will consider putting some of the issues mentioned by Felice Pace on the next agenda.
- Agendum 8        Staff is to provide a one-page Flow Study briefing to Herger and other congressional delegates.
- Agendum 10a     The Task Force formed an Oversight Committee. The Committee was charged with: 1) looking at the Long Range Plan recommendations and modify them per Mid-term Evaluation and 2) look at major recommendations in the Mid-term Evaluation and bring a set if those to the Task Force to be implemented. Members: Kent Bulfinch, Chair, Mike Belchik, Dave Bitts, Ronnie Pierce, and Keith Wilkinson.
- Agendum 10b     The staff will prepare a list for the Task Force on the distribution of the Mid-term Evaluation Report. Some report recipients so far are: Task Force, Technical Work Group, Klamath Fishery Management Council, Congressional staff, County Supervisors, Resource Conservation Districts, CRMPs, Sub-basin Planners, Irrigation Districts, and BOR representative, Bernice Sullivan.
- Agendum 11b     The staff will draft a letter to the National Marine Fisheries Service and The Resources Agency regarding capabilities of the Task Force within the Klamath Basin. Since 1986, the Task Force has ranked project proposals. A number of the proposals are still unfunded. This process will be a good tool to get projects on the ground. In the letter, the different groups will be identified that are represented in the Task Force and groups that are advisory to the Task Force. Cc: Trinity Task Force.
- Agendum 11b     Add to the next agenda Paul Kirk's recommendation to invite Mark Lancaster, Multi-County Coordinator, to bring to light of the five county process. Paul Kirk will ask Mark Lancaster to come to the next meeting.
- Agendum 11b     The Task Force wants the Long-term Funding Subcommittee to continue working on their proposal. Keith Wilkinson will represent the Task Force. The Task Force will ask the Klamath Fishery Management Council if Troy Fletcher can be the representative for the Council.

Agendum 14      The Task Force Chair has asked the TWG to assist the Sub-basin Planning Coordinators in the development and implementation of the Sub-basin Plans. The Task Force-approved Sub-basin Action Plan Outline shall be used as a flexible outline in the development of these plans. TWG assistance will provide additional scientific expertise to this effort.

Agendum 14      The staff will incorporate Kent Bulfinch's six points and provide a Final Report Outline no later than the February meeting to the Sub-basin Planning Coordinators for use in reporting next June.

**Motions:**

Agendum 3a      Agenda was approved. \*Keith Wilkinson \*Second: Joan Smith \*\*Motion Passes\*\*

Agendum 3a      Adoption of the Minutes from the February meeting. \*Keith Wilkinson \*Second: Mike Rode \*\*Motion Passes\*\*

Agendum 15      In Category 3, projects on the flip chart shall be funded as indicated in priority order. (PC-02, FP-15, HP-06, FP-03, FP-07, HP-09, FP-02, FP-09, FP-06 and HP-07). We expect the Fish and Wildlife Service to seek funding for the shortfall from Bureau of Reclamation for FP-09. However, should another project get funded by another source, FP-09 shall be more fully funded. If there is additional project money available from prior years, FP-09 shall be more fully funded. If there is additional project money available after fully funding FP-09, then FP-06 would be funded. If there is additional project money available after fully funding FP-09 and FP-06, then HP-07 would be funded. \*Dave Bitts \*Second: Paul Kirk \*\*Motion Passes\*\* Abstain: Bulfinch, Wilkinson and Belchik

Agendum 15      In Category 1, approve funding down to E-04 with the stipulation that the Hoopa Tribe accepted the reduction in funding for E-04 to about \$34,000. \*Elwood \*Second: Russell Abstain: Wilkinson and Belchik \*\*Motion Passes\*\*

Agendum 15      In Category 2, funding shall be equally divided among the Sub-basin Planning Groups. \*Kirk \*Second: Bitts \*Abstain: Wilkinson and Belchik \*\*Motion Passes\*\*